



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,892	10/26/1999	RAIMUND WEIFFEN	4452-263	3906
7	590 09/03/2002			
THOMAS C PONTANI ESQ COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE 551 FIFTH AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			WILLIAMS, THOMAS J	
SUITE 1210 NEW YORK, NY 10176 ART UNIT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			3683	
			DATE MAILED: 09/03/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5.	Application No.	o. Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/427,892	WEIFFEN ET AL.			
i Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit	-		
	Thomas J. Williams	3683			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess		
THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	i.		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed a	mendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT	place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,9 and 10.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. $\hfill \square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on $\underline{\hspace{1cm}}$ is	a) approved or b) disapproved	roved by the Examin	er.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10. Other:					

Continuation of 2. NOTE: amended claim 1 again recites the aspect of a sole passage between the two working chambers. However, this issue was previously rejected as lacking support in the specification. The disclosure lacks support for the limitation of having "only one" passageway connecting the two work chambers. Figure 1 is viewed as being a general representation of the invention and therefore cannot be relied upon as clearly teaching the limitation of a "sole" passageway between the two chambers. As stated in the rejection mailed May 17, 2001 the existence of check valves at the bottom of the cylinder raises questions regarding potential "other" fluid passages between the two work chambers.

JACK LAVINDER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

2